

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace the 22 pages of informal drawings with the enclosed 20 pages of formal drawings.

Please note that the last three informal drawings were included on the last single page of the formal drawings.

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are presently pending in the application. Claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by LaJoie (6,772,433). Claims 21-25 and 27-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ishizaki (6,108,002). Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Ishizaki. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaki in view of Schein (6,732,369). Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishizaki in view of Russo (6,732,366).

Applicant hereby submits formal drawings to replace the originally filed informal drawings filed on June 29, 2001.

Claims 1-12 were rejected as being anticipated by LaJoie. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-12, as amended, are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons stated below. The present invention is directed towards a bi-directional service(s) that is stored, rendered, and updated in a bi-directional services database. More specifically, the database is populated with information that is subsequently displayed in a program guide. LaJoie does not teach or imply a database that is populated with bi-directional services that is subsequently displayed in a program guide. Specifically, FIG. 5 of LaJoie is merely equivalent to FIG. 10, which provides background information of the present invention.

Additionally, LaJoie does not teach or imply querying a bi-directional services database to determine whether or not a bi-directional service requested is available. Specifically, Col. 11, lines 44-50 of LaJoie is directed towards authorizing subscribers for certain programs and/or services usually depending upon the package purchased by the subscriber. The servers typically receive this information for each set-top terminal via a billing system or via the set-top terminal itself. There is no teaching or implication that when the servers receive the package and service information that a bi-directional database is queried to determine whether or not a service is available. In fact, when the servers receive the information, the program and/or service is processed according to the when, where, and how data.

Furthermore, LaJoie does not teach or imply updating the bi-directional services database to reflect that a service has been rendered mainly because there is no mention or allusion to a bi-directional services database in the LaJoie teachings. Respectfully, Applicant submits that the Examiner's suggestion that because LaJoie teaches a system that prompts a user to enter a PIN number and then displays a "database" indicating past IPPV events is incorrect. Typically, a set-top terminal includes memory that stores the number of events purchased by a subscriber. These stored events are later used for billing purposes. This is not analogous to the bi-directional services database of the present invention.

It is believed, therefore, that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-12 are patentable over the cited art. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection under 102(e) be reexamined in light of the amendment to claim 1 and the above remarks.

Claims 13-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over LaJoie in view of Ishizaki. For the same reasons stated above, Applicants believe that claims 13-20 are patentable over LaJoie in view of Ishizaki either alone or in combination. More specifically, there is no teaching or implication of a bi-directional services database in Lajoie. Furthermore, since there is no teaching or implication of a bi-directional services database, there is no mention or teaching of querying, rendering, and updating a bi-directional services database.

Claims 21-31 have been canceled. Reconsideration and reexamination of the present application is requested in view of the foregoing amendment and in view of the following remarks.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated August 25, 2005. Claims 1-20 will be pending in the present application upon entry of the present amendment, with claims 1 and 13 being independent. Based on the amendments and remarks set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject patent application is in condition for allowance. Because the claims may include additional elements that are not taught or suggested by the cited art, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Upon entry of the foregoing Response, the above-identified patent application includes 2 independent claims. Because Applicant has previously paid for 31 total claims and 3 independent claims, Applicant submits that no additional fee is due. Should it be determined that any additional fee is due or any excess fee has been received, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to deposit account #19-0761.


Should the Examiner have any comments or suggestions that would place the subject patent application in better condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned agent at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted:

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Scientific-Atlanta, Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept. MS 4.3.510
5030 Sugarloaf Parkway
Lawrenceville, GA 30044

By:


WM. BROOK LAFFERTY
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 39,259
Phone: (770) 236-2114
Fax No.: (770) 236-4806

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on September 23, 2005.


Faye Ropski